



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/823,064

04/12/2004

Jayasimha Nuggehalli

49986-0538

3972

29989

7590

03/12/2008

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

PACHOL, NICHOLAS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/823,064	Applicant(s) NUGGEHALLI ET AL.	
	Examiner Nicholas C. Pachol	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/29/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: Regarding Claim 13, line 3 states "... the printer driver is no fully ..." The claim should read "... the printer driver is not fully ..." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishida (US 2004/0105113).

Regarding Claim 1, an apparatus (Page 1, paragraph 11) comprising: a non-volatile storage device (Page 1, paragraph 12); an application program (Page 1, paragraph 10); and a printer driver (Page 1, paragraph 11) configured to retrieve configuration data from a printing device (Page 1, paragraph 13), and cause the configuration data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device (Page 1, paragraph 14).

Regarding Claim 2, wherein the application program is configured to use the configuration data to facilitate printing of an electronic document (Page 3, paragraph 64).

Regarding Claim 3, wherein the application program is configured to use the configuration data to generate one or more graphical user interface objects that are displayed on a graphical user interface in association with the printing of an electronic document (Page 3, paragraph 63 and Page 4, paragraph 72), where since the user can change settings the interface provided is going to be a graphical user interface in order to change these settings).

Regarding Claim 7, wherein the configuration data indicates one or more options installed on the printing device (Page 3, paragraph 63).

Regarding Claim 8, wherein the configuration data indicates one or more source trays available on the printing device (Page 3, paragraph 63).

Regarding Claim 10, wherein the configuration data indicates one or more commands supported by the printing device (Page 3, paragraph 63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida (US 2004/0105113) in view of Hanson (US 6,148,346).

Regarding Claim 4, Ishida does not teach wherein: configuration data includes bitmap data for the printing device, and the application program is configured to cause the bitmap data to be displayed on a graphical user interface in association with the printing of an electronic document.

However, Hanson does teach wherein: configuration data includes bitmap data for the printing device (Column 5, lines 13-22, where the bitmap data is taken as a form of graphical data), and the application program is configured to cause the bitmap data to be displayed on a graphical user interface in association with the printing of an electronic document (Column 5, lines 13-22).

Ishida and Hanson are combinable because they are both dealing with a user working with printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ishida with the teachings of Hanson for the purpose of allowing for two way communications between a computer and a printer (Hanson: Column 2, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claim 5, Ishida does not teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to cause a graphical user interface object to be displayed on a graphical user interface, wherein the graphical user interface object includes a link with a URL associated with bitmap data included in the configuration data stored on the printing device.

However Hanson does teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to cause a graphical user interface object to be displayed on a graphical user interface, wherein the graphical user interface object includes a link with a URL associated with bitmap data included in the configuration data stored on the printing device (Column 5, lines 23-43, where the bitmap data is taken as a form of graphical data and the URL is treated as a link to another menu).

Ishida and Hanson are combinable because they are both dealing with a GUI in relation to printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ishida with the teachings of Hanson for the purpose of allowing for two way communications between a computer and a printer (Hanson: Column 2, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claim 6, Hanson further teaches wherein the printer driver is further configured to in response to detecting a user selection of the link, retrieve the bitmap data from the printing device and cause the bitmap data to be displayed on the graphical user interface.

Ishida and Hanson are combinable because they are both dealing with a GUI in relation to printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ishida with the teachings of Hanson for the purpose of allowing for two way communications between a computer and a printer (Hanson: Column 2, lines 1-5).

6. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida (US 2004/0105113) in view of Shin (US 6,351,320).

Regarding Claim 9, Ishida does not teach wherein the configuration data indicates one or more media types available on the printing device.

However, Shin does teach wherein the configuration data indicates one or more media types available on the printing device (Column 9, lines 50-52).

Ishida and Shin are combinable because they both deal with interfaces in regards to printers and printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ishida with the teachings of Shin for the purpose of providing a memory saving printer driver for controlling output image aspects (Shin: Column 2, lines 63-65).

Regarding Claim 11, Ishida does not teach wherein the configuration data includes program logic used by the printer driver.

However Shin does teach wherein the configuration data includes program logic used by the printer driver (Column 9, lines 25-33).

Ishida and Shin are combinable because they both deal with interfaces in regards to printers and printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ishida with the teachings of Shin for the purpose of providing a memory saving printer driver for controlling output image aspects (Shin: Column 2, lines 63-65).

7. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida (US 2004/0105113) in view of Wilson (GB 2,347,766).

Regarding Claim 12, Ishida does not teach wherein: the configuration data includes first version identification data that indicates a version of the configuration data retrieved by the printer driver, and the printer driver is further configured to: retrieve second version identification data from the printing device, wherein the second version identification data indicates a version of the configuration data maintained on the printing device, compare the first version identification data to the second version identification data, and if the comparison of the first version identification data to the second version identification data indicates that the version of configuration data maintained on the printing device is more recent than the version of configuration data retrieved by the printer driver, then the printer driver retrieving the more recent version of the configuration data from the printing device.

However, Wilson does teach wherein: the configuration data includes first version identification data that indicates a version of the configuration data retrieved by the printer driver (Page 5, lines 7-22), and the printer driver is further configured to: retrieve second version identification data from the printing device, wherein the second version identification data indicates a version of the configuration data maintained on the printing device (Page 5, lines 7-26), compare the first version identification data to the second version identification data (Page 5, lines 28-34), and if the comparison of the first version identification data to the second version identification data indicates that the version of configuration data maintained on the printing device is more recent than the

Art Unit: 2625

version of configuration data retrieved by the printer driver, then the printer driver retrieving the more recent version of the configuration data from the printing device (Page 5, lines 28-34).

Ishida and Wilson are combinable because they both are dealing with working with printer drivers.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ishida with the teachings of Wilson to allow the user not to have to deal with problems with the print driver when printing (Wilson: Page 6, lines 15-19).

Regarding Claim 13, Ishida does not teach wherein the printer driver is configured to retrieve the configuration data from the printing device in response to an indication that the printer driver is no fully compatible with the printing device.

However Wilson does teach wherein the printer driver is configured to retrieve the configuration data from the printing device in response to an indication that the printer driver is no fully compatible with the printing device (Page 5, lines 28-34).

Ishida and Wilson are combinable because they both are dealing with working with printer drivers.

Therefore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ishida with the teachings of Wilson to allow the user not to have to deal with problems with the print driver when printing (Wilson: Page 6, lines 15-19).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida (US 2004/0105113) in view of Vidyanand (US 6,967,728)

Regarding Claim 14, Ishida does not teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to: retrieve second configuration data from a second printing device, and cause the second configuration data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device.

However Vidyanand does teach wherein the printer driver is further configured to: retrieve second configuration data from a second printing device (Column 3, lines 28-48) cause the second configuration data to be stored on the non-volatile storage device (Column 5, lines 23-28).

Ishida and Vidyanand are combinable because they both deal with installing printer drivers.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ishida with the teachings of Vidyanand for the purpose of providing transferable printer drive preferences (Vidyanand : Column 3, lines 18-24).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas C. Pachol whose telephone number is 571-270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T, 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. (EST), Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N.P.
02/27/08

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625